DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 639 SO 023 818

AUTHOR Bjerstedt, Ake
TITLE Peace Education Approaches among Younger and Older Students in Schools. Peace Education Reports. No. 8.
INSTITUTION Lund Univ. (Sweden). Dept. of Psychology.
REPORT NO ISSN-1101-6426
PUB DATE Sep 93
NOTE 47p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Age Differences; Children; *Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Global Approach; International Education; Nuclear Warfare; Peace; *Preschool Education; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

This report used data from an interview study with international experts to examine the extent that peace education is relevant at various ages and to look at how the age of pupils affect the design of a pedagogy for peace. The two parts of the report provided replies from 50 experts representing 22 countries. Part 1 attempts to summarize major aspects of the relationship of age level to education for peace. In several cases, the interviewees made general comments claiming that in actual fact, age differences were of considerably less importance than imagined. Some interviewees emphasized the fact that little is known in the area. Part 2 provides detailed documentation of the 50 interview answers. (CK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PEACE EDUCATION APPROACHES AMONG YOUNGER AND OLDER STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS

Åke Bjerstedt

To what extent is peace education relevant at various ages, and to what extent should the age of the pupils affect the design of a pedagogy for peace? In the present report, these questions are discussed, using primarily data from an interview study with international experts.

Part I presents an attempt to summarize some major aspects of the theme, "Age level and education for peace"; while Part II gives a more detailed documentation of our interview answers in this area. This documentation contains replies from fifty experts representing twenty-two countries.

Keywords: Age differences, global approach, interviews, nuclear war, peace education.

PART I

To what extent is peace education relevant at various ages, and *to what extent should the age of the pupils or the level they are studying at affect the design of a pedagogy for peace?* Those are issues that have been addressed from different perspectives in the international debate. In what follows, I shall briefly discuss these questions, using primarily data from an interview study with international experts carried out by our project, "Preparedness for Peace" (at the Malmö School of Education), but also giving some notes from other stadies conducted in our project.

Part I of this report presents my attempt to summarize some major aspects of the theme, "Age level and education for peace"; while Part II gives a more detailed documention of our interview answers in this area. This documentation contains replies from fifty experts representing twenty-two countries, with respect to the question: "What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in school?" – More information about the fifty experts is available in a separate report (Bjerstedt, 1993).

Some general views of age adjustment as expressed in the interviews with experts

In several cases, our interviewees make general comments on that issue, claiming that in actual fact, age differences are of considerably less importance than we might imagine. In any case they present no obstacle to offering peace education at certain ages; peace education – in some sense – can be given at all levels and sometimes by means of a similar methodology. In her answer, Elise Boulding gives a concrete description of her own attempt to discuss peace with the pupils at all the levels of a Chicago school; she finishes her description by saying "There are no age limits. You can certainly deal with these issues with 3- and 4-year-olds".

Some interviewees emphasize the fact that we know too little in this area. This is simply an area where there is a palpable need for more pedagogical and developmental-psychological research.

A few comments of a more specific character are worth mentioning. Gerald F. Mische claims that it is important, especially in a long-term perspective, to work with younger children, who are less prejudiced and more susceptible to changing their attitudes; Robert Muller emphasizes the

importance of not preventing the pupils at the older levels from preserving a natural, sentimental view of life by stressing the one-sided development of intellect.

Age adjustment and participatory instructional methodology

It is a fundamental methodological consideration in pedagogical work in general that it is important to take into account the starting-points of the pupils in question (their own conceptions, experiences of problems, etc), because this facilitates the creation of a cognitive context and a personal commitment. It may also be important that the pupils be allowed to participate in the design of the continued pedagogical process as well as in decisions about the choice of materials and methods. A general design of this kind also facilitates the age adjustment discussed here; it will partly be an automatic consequence of taking the pupils' initial attitudes and wishes into account. (This view is expressed by Eva Nordland and Riitta Wahlström, among others.)

Magnus Haavelsrud stresses the importance of a dialogue-oriented education, but he finds that it often is more difficult to get this type of education accepted at higher school lents: "I've heard people say that those who study at school should learn things before they can have any opinions. Such a pedagogical attitude is very dangerous. If it is systematized, it will kill people's attempts to think, to be critical. ...at the day-care center you may be allowed to think for yourself, but the older you are, the more conformity is required of you. ... If shouldn't be like that. Instead, the opportunities to participate in a fruitful dialogue should increase continuously."

Some experiences of talks conducted with children within the project

In her report (1989) Anna-Lena Tvingstedt, who analyzed the talks conducted in the project with pupils in grade 2, writes that her overall impression is that they dealt with a subject that is important to the pupils and that they take very seriously. It is also obvious, however, that it is a subject that many of them do not have adequate opportunities to discuss.

Tvingstedt writes that she has the impression that the pupils interviewed are at an age when they look at the world around them with open and

unjaundiced eyes. They have not yet acquired the kind of defence mechanisms that prevent them from seeing and reacting, which also, however, means that they are more vulnerable. As one of them puts it: "Children are more sensitive than adults, you know". At the same time, children live in an information society that showers them with pictures, opinions and events from all over the world, often in a rather fragmentary way, without any background and rarely in a comprehensible context. All this information would have to be sorted, discussed and processed to make it manageable, and not just frightening, which the adults in these children's environment may not have the time or the energy or the resources to achieve. When the information becomes too overwhelming, we have a tendency to try to protect ourselves by withdrawing. When the interviewer asked one of the girls whether she watched Rapport (a Swedish news broadcast), she answered: "No. I don't watch that any more. I always turn it off then, because I know there will be so many horrible things on. I don't want to have any more horrible things to think about, I guess."

At the end of her report (pp. 53-54), Anna-Lena Tvingstedt draws the following conclusion, among others: "The interviews with pupils in grade 2 reported here clearly demonstrate that the children have a fear of war that they need assistance in dealing with. They need help to be able to express their thoughts and feelings. They need someone who listens to them with respect, and they need to be taken seriously instead of being treated with the kind of comforting words that imply a nullification of their feelings and thus, indirectly, of themselves. They also, however, need assistance in finding paths to constructive action that they, at their level, can experience as being meaningful..."

Karin Utas Carlsson (1990) has reported on similar conversations about war and peace with pupils in grade 5, and the picture that emerges displays several similarities with the one just discussed. The children in grade 5 were worried about the threat of nuclear weapons. They rarely had anyone they could talk to about their concern. Here, communication between children and adults was obstructed.

The report contains plenty of detailed information that cannot be itemized here. It may, however, be interesting to listen to some of the final questions and comments presented by the author (pp. 129-131): "Do children and young people get to see the misery in the world, but no solutions, no means of creating a more peaceful world? Are we even trying to suggest the vision of a peaceful, demilitarized world? ... Helping young people to

understand the world, to sort and process the news is another task. They need to hear a lot about the positive things that occur, the constructive solutions and what they themselves can do. – Children and young people also lack the vision of the support we can give each other by actually all of us sharing the conditions of life and being hostages in the atomic age. Instead, they experience alienation as a consequence of the worry and anxiety that exist among the adult generation and that result in silence and taboos because of the psychological defence mechanisms (denial and repression)... – Parents are needed in peace education. There is a lack of real cooperation between the school and the pupils' homes. Children are emotionally rooted in their homes, and peace education addresses existential issues. That is why cooperation is important. It would be a beginning if the parents at various schools formed groups to discuss what it is like to be a parent in the atomic age."

How do we deal with the threat of nuclear weapons and the anxiety children of different ages experience in connection with it?

A special aspect of age adjustment that was frequently touched upon in the project interviews with experts from various countries was the one of how to deal with the threat of nuclear weapons. That is also an issue that has intermittently played a prominent part in the public debate on the advantages and drawbacks of peace education. It is probably correct to claim that the continued nuclear proliferation and the increased awareness among certain groups of the violent consequences of using such weapons were some of the foremost reasons why peace education gained increasing prominence during the eighties. Many people felt that there was an urgent need for information here; young people who were about to vote about the foreign policy of our countries had to be aware of and take a stance on the new ominous pictures shared by all of humankind. Hence the consequences of modern warfare became a natural component of peace education or, as it was called in some places, "nuclear age education". This was an issue that was too important to be delegated to a small group within the military and researchers devoted to weapons technology; it was the issue of the future of humankind, which ought to be included in basic education in civics.

At the same time, however, critical voices were raised against dealing with the consequences of nuclear war at school. There were various reasons

for this criticism, but one of the observations most frequently made was that there was a risk of making children and young people worried and anxious, that peace education might jeopardize the "mental health" of the population and that it was irresponsible to "frighten young children". Naturally, those who saw it as an important assignment of the schools to spread information about the risks of modern weapons supplied a large number of counterarguments. For example, what was a better sign of mental health: that you worried about nuclear weapons or that you did *not*? As a matter of fact, the pupils at school do not live in a protected environment. Irrespective of the instruction they receive at school, they are exposed via many different sources – not least TV and films – to more or less correct information about the threat of weapons. Is it not reasonable, then, that they get an opportunity to discuss their anxiety and process it with the relevant teachers?

The advocates of peace education have gradually reached a certain degree of agreement. This is an area where the teacher must be keenly alive to the particular needs of the group to be taught and also take the developmental level of the pupils into consideration. Age adjustment becomes an important factor. There is no reason why we should "lecture" on, or show horror films about, the consequences of nuclear war among young pupils. On the other hand, the teacher must be prepared to answer the pupils' questions and provide them with opportunities to process their thoughts and feelings. This is a difficult area where the inexperienced teacher may need advice and assistance. Among older pupils, however, it is more natural to provide direct information by means of non-fiction texts and films, for example, taking into account the pupils' need for follow-up discussions. The interviewees who addressed this issue were generally agreed on advocating the procedure suggested here, although they tended to assign slightly different degrees of importance to individual parts of it. The following examples may serve to illustrate the views expressed.

"Well, as I said, among younger children the emphasis would be on fostering. That also means that I think there would be no reason to go into details – for example, about the armaments race or give details about nuclear weapons. On the other hand, they themselves may ask questions about such things, or say that they are afraid of a nuclear war. In that case, as a teacher you should be prepared to provide sensible answers, appropriate for the age level. You could say, for example, that it is true that nuclear weapons are dangerous, bat that many adults are doing all they can to see to

it that such weapons will never be used, or that they will be dismantled, and that's the reason why so many teachers and parents take part in peace marches or make speeches about peace." (Birgit Brock-Utne.)

"I believe that a real discussion of conflicts beyond the classroom that concern different nations can begin in a really meaningful way only in late childhood. Then I would really talk about other nations, war and conflicts from a more historical perspective.

But that doesn't mean I wouldn't expose younger children, if they have questions about international conflicts. ... obviously many children became concerned about war when the Gulf war was going on. They had a lot of questions... One should try to answer children's questions honestly. But I would have a bias not to overwhelm let's say 7-year-olds or 5-year-olds with details about war...". (Petra Hesse.)

"Some of the opponents of introducing issues of nuclear war into the curriculum have argued that – particularly when you deal with younger students – you are frightening them and artificially creating problems. --- On the other hand, I don't subscribe to the notion that therefore we can't deal with the threat of war in schools. The fact of the matter is that there is no way in which children living in the modern world and watching television freely and frequently can avoid confrontation with the question of nuclear weapons and nuclear war. Just because you keep it out of school you are not going to keep it out of their lives. So I don't accept the notion that you can't introduce it in schools, but I do think that one has to be sensitive about *how* it is introduced, and the more so the younger the children are." (Herbert C. Kelman.)

"One criticism, which I think is justified in some instances, of peace education in Australia is showing films like 'The Day after' to young children who are terrified by these films. I cannot emphasize too strongly that many of the films dealing with the effects of nuclear war, films about concentration camps and so on, must be kept to the upper reaches of the senior school. I know this sounds dogmatic. But if this material is introduced too soon, it often can have very distressing effects. With younger people we should stress positive and hopeful aspects as as much as possible." (Max Lawson.)

Examples of components in the peace education of young children

We sometimes differentiate between *implicit* peace education, where we do not primarily talk about war and peace but get accustomed to peaceful coexistence and have an opportunity to develop fundamental values in keeping with a life in peace and justice, and *explicit* peace education, where teaching meterials consist of facts and theories about war and peace. Of course, implicit peace education can be important at any age, but it becomes particularly natural and fundamental in our contacts with young children, whereas the explicit type of peace education is primarily to be used with older pupils.

The value perspective and preparedness for action associated with *the principle of non-violence* can be promoted in a natural way even among the youngest pupils. Naturally, there will not be any theoretical discussions, but it is an important task to bring up children from the very beginning so that they do not get accustomed to using violence as a method of solving problems. Among other things, it is important for us as adults to set a good example. We should also take great pains to react positively to types of behaviour that we would like to reinforce. It is also natural to talk about some of the basic principles of creative conflict resolution, but our own behaviour as a model and positive reactions to nonviolent behaviour are likely to be the most important factors when dealing with very young children.

Apart from that, it is obvious that emotional insecurity is an excellent breeding ground for intolerant group attitudes and a tendency to choose aggressive actions. Consequently it is important to create a good *emotional basic security*, to make it possible for children to experience that human relations can be based on mutual trust and confidence. This may function as a long-term inoculation against aggressive tendencies based on anxiety.

Even at an early age it is essential to get used to *social contacts* with people who are different in various respects and to learn to appreciate differences rather than disparaging *a priori* what is deviant.

We quote some typical formulations in this area from our expert interviewees, dealing with the importance of an early promotion of cooperative attitudes, non-violence, confidence-building and communication skills:

"With younger students I would want to place the emphasis on developing positive concepts, on developing cooperative attitudes and developing the attitudes." (James Collinge.)

"In younger children certainly you want to develop the basic orientations of cooperation and respect for self and respect for others, which are fundamental to dealing peacefully with others in a constructive manner, even when there are important differences between oneself and the others. And I think that has to be done in terms of the immediate realities for younger children...". (Morton Deutsch.)

"In Israel, the younger the children are, the easier it is to eliminate the hatred and the mistrust and the fear. So my general approach would be to start as early as possible, even in the kindergarten, stressing the importance of arranging meetings between children of different backgrounds." (Haim Gordon.)

"I think that generally amongst younger students it is appropriate to do confidence-building exercises, talk about different races, different cultures, different values that people have, work on communication skills." (Ian M. Harris.)

"Primary teachers dealing with children from 5 to 11 will very much look at conflicts and cooperation and issues that deal with fairness or justice, that is deal with the classroom climate and the school atmosphere." (David Hicks.)

It is often said that peace education should involve not only knowledge, but also feelings and actions; and this, in principle, is a reasonable view. However, when we deal with young children the teachers should be very careful not to press action patterns on their pupils. "Our experience is that some of the resistances to peace education in the past were related to the fact that some of the outreaches were inappropriate and some of the expectations put upon students were inappropriate to their developmental readiness. When I hear that a teacher of young children have them involved in a boycot or a religion teacher have the students go out to solicit names for a petition against abortion, I would question the appropriateness of such actions. I do not think that the school should stimulate advocacy for specific positions, although – at the appropriate age level – the issues should be explored and debated." (Kathleen Kanet.)

Benefiting from openness to contacts and curiosity about the global village at the intermediate level

The intermediate level (grades 4-6) is likely to be particularly suitable for addressing issues connected with the topic "responsibility as a citizen of the

global village". At this age, the pupils have been through the first years of school acclimatization and acquiring fundamental skills and are able to comprehend simple texts. In grades 4-6 they are usually open to contacts and curious about the global village. In addition, instruction is still organized so that it is easy for the classroom teacher to arrange inter-disciplinary studies (there is as yet no hard-and-fast organization into subject areas with different teachers). These advantages should be utilized, e.g. to promote the pupils' interest in foreign countries and a sense of solidarity with Spaceship Earth's many passengers and their mutual concerns. In this context, it will be the most natural thing in the world to try to establish contacts with people of the same age in foreign lands – an opportunity which is, regrettably, not often enough seized. Among the goals here is trying to prevent the acquisition of negative stereotypes about alien groups, both in the global society and in one's immediate environment – to create a certain insight into the injustices in the world and preparedness to contribute, to the extent possible, to the effort of helping to bring about a future society that will be more characterized by peace, justice and respect for human rights.

In this case, I first quote two formulations from a study on Scandinavian interviewees (Ankarstrand-Lindström & Bjerstedt, 1988):

"On the whole, I think that children at the intermediate level – i.e. in grades 4, 5 and 6 – are much more socially engaged and much more receptive to social issues and questions of right and wrong than older children. We tend to address those issues in the higher grades because we think they may cause some anxiety, but the pupils in the higher grades are extremely self-centred. They are only interested in themselves, maybe some kind of job and perhaps a girlfriend. We have to go further down and start to feel our way, so that the pupils get a chance to ask questions, since it is crucial to take their own thoughts as a starting-point." (Torben Pöhler.)

"World problems are an important area at the intermediate level. That's where the pupils have feelings and imagination and an enormous need to acquire knowledge." (Ella Svensson.)

These views are in principle corroborated by the developmental research carried out by Petra Hesse and formulated in the following way:

"About the age of 10-11-12 it's different. We find in our research that that's the age when children begin to talk about conflicts between groups, begin to be curious about the origins of war. So somehow I believe that concern for different nations maybe can begin in a really meaningful way

only in late childhood. Then I would really talk about other nations, war and conflict from a more historical perspective." (Petra Hesse.)

Higher levels: Analysis, insight, consciousness-raising

Basically, the same goal areas are relevant at higher school levels. The principal differences are usually that here the cognitive components (knowledge and the processing of knowledge) tend to come to the fore to a larger extent, and that the value perspectives should now be made the object of a more conscious verbalization and a more detailed discussion. The analyses carried out within our project demonstrate, among other things, that the older pupils often have an impressive commitment to the issues of war and peace, while at the same time their knowledge in that field – including knowledge that is of practical relevance to the individual – may be quite insufficient (cf for example Svensson, 1989 and 1990). – The character of the activities at the higher levels also changes because these levels are normally organized in a different way (there is greater emphasis on individual subjects and teachers of special subjects). Since the question of what can be done in the area of peace education in individual school subjects and groups of school subjects will be dealt with in a separate report, however, I shall here confine myself to adding a few more general quotations on peace education at higher school levels:

"With older students we have worked, for example, with newspaper cuttings, commenting events and with videos, depending on the interests that the students have and what they themselves propose. With older students, we prefer to ask the students what they themselves would prefer to discuss in terms of peace. It is marvellous how many ideas come out! We sort of leave the initiatives in their hands, and then act as facilitators or mediators." (James Calleja.)

"At advanced levels of education we'll find subject-oriented approaches more suitable. Look at sciences. Developing social responsibility in using technological advances should belong to the standards of every Maths and Physics teaching. So there is no need to create special curricula on peace education. The only necessity is that teachers bear in mind the objectives of peace education. Nevertheless, I think this has to be thought through carefully. Think about physical education, for instance. If I make competition the most important thing in physical training, then this could be counterproductive to peace education. In this case peace education is a cross-cur-

ricular approach permeating every subject and every hour in the school's timetable." (Hanns-Fred Rathenow.)

"All those things I have now mentioned as relevant for young students can be dealt with also at a secondary level, but at that stage they can be discussed in more abstract terms, concepts like disarmament, structural violence, ecological balance can be introduced etc. The data related to poverty and development, the arms race expenditures etc. can also be studied." (Betty Reardon.)

PART II

Susan Alexander (Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA)

It's another way of asking what the relevant developmental stages are. We all know that the younger students developmentally have small circles in which they operate: the family, the neighborhood, the school, and probably nothing beyond that. They are not capable of abstract reasoning. So, with older students you can be more abstract. If you try to ask young elementary students about democracy (and democracy is an abstract concept), they couldn't respond to it except by giving concrete examples. So I think that is a key distinction: the concrete versus the abstract.

Another one is that issues need to be simplified with younger students. That frightens me, because I think most issues, including peace issues, are complex, and some of them are deeply complex. This is particularly true for the use of violence.

On the other hand, I think that young children can be made aware of the garbage they create and discuss the environmental issues related to this. Sometimes people think that singing peaceful songs with younger students is a sort of peace education. I cannot really agree with that. It's very nice and can be very important, but there are two words to "peace education", and the second one is "education". For me, this is not particularly education.

ÅB: Do you see education related to values as important for peace education, and how does this relate to age differences?

SA: Non-violence would be an example of such a value. Some would say that transcending violence is basic to the concept of peace education. It's very easy for white Westerners to say that non-violence should be an absolute value, but do I have the right to say that to blacks in South Africa – who have been suffering under Apartheid? The same is true with the Palestinian intifada. It's so easy, especially in retrospect, to say that non-violence is an absolute value that we should teach for, and there is a part of me who believes that. On the other hand, I know that the only thing that's making the world take Palestinians seriously is that they did engage in a violent uprising. Until they did, nobody paid any attention to them.

So what I'm trying to say is that even a value that means so much to me as non-violence does is more complicated than it seems at first, and I think that's true of every value, especially the ones that we are passionate about

ourselves.

ÅB: And what do you conclude from that as to the education in school?

SA: With the students I would examine the values this way. I think what you find in this country with students as they start off, most would accept those values. As a teacher, it's my job to complicate their thinking and take that certainty away from them for a while, and question those values and say: Are you sure? But what about this? I should make them test those values in some sort of baptism of fire emotionally and intellectually, and then come back to them after that. They shouldn't be left with "easy values" which they have never tested. For us in America, so many of our values never get tested.

So I think then that in values education it would be important for all the students to explore values, ask why they are important, and try to make them more complex. Then they should choose again in the light of the awareness of the full complexity. You eventually have to choose to be human, but you must do so, I think, in the light of full awareness of information of what's involved.

Robert Aspeslagh (Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

Young children are also very good at making decisions etc. Of course, there are some differences, things that you can do better in older age groups than in younger ones. But on the whole, I would say that the differences should not be overemphasized. Young kids like to learn too.

Anima Bose (New Delhi, India)

For younger students, the example of the teacher and the example of the parents at home are very important. Also, the parent-teacher cooperation is important. What the teacher says and does, and what the parents say or do reflect their values. If the children see contradictory values, they may get very upset. But at the university level, I think, the teachers and students become partners. This opens up other possibilities in peace education also. There need not be many books, but effective books would be needed, and if necessary, written.

ÅB: Now you separated the university students from the others, but if you

think of the school level, there is a wide range of ages. Would there be some differences in how you handle peace education within that range?
AB: There would be differences related to the age of the students and their development, of course, but even at the age of 16 or 17, if a young person is still in school, he/she is, in many ways, different from the university student. He lives within a school world, dominated by the teachers as teachers – not as partners.

Elise Boulding (Boulder, Colorado, USA)

I had an interesting experience of spending a week in a private school in Chicago, where I went into every grade level from the 4-year olds through the seniors. The challenge for me was to find ways to deal with peace possibilities and hopes for a better future suited to each level. I tried very much to put myself, as far as I could, into the life-frame of the age I was with. Fortunately we have 15 grandchildren, so it wasn't so hard for me – the youngest is a year old and the oldest is 19.

For example, with the pre-school I used very simple concrete things, like showing them a stone. What could you do with a stone? Of course, you could pick it up and throw it at somebody. But the number of things those little children thought of to do with the stone were marvellous: drawing pictures with it, using it as a paper weight, making a sculpture with it – they had all kinds of ideas. So I pointed out to them that the difference between using a stone for peace work – to make other people more comfortable or to hurt people – wasn't in the stone itself; it was in what the child did. In such ways I tried, at every age, to think what kind of experiences they were having and the level at which they would be thinking. There are no age limits. You can certainly deal with these issues with 3- and 4-year olds.

Birgit Brock-Utne (Oslo, Norway)

Well, as I said, among younger children the emphasis would be on fostering. That also means that I think there would be no reason to go into details – for example, about the armaments race or give details about nuclear weapons. On the other hand, they themselves may ask questions about such

things, or say that they are afraid of a nuclear war. In that case, as a teacher you should be prepared to provide sensible answers, appropriate for the age level. You could say, for example, that it is true that nuclear weapons are dangerous, but that many adults are doing all they can to see to it that such weapons will never be used, or that they will be dismantled, and that's the reason why so many teachers and parents take part in peace marches or make speeches about peace.

Otherwise, the most important thing at the lower levels is to become involved with the surrounding social relations, e.g. attitudes towards those who are "different" (who come from foreign countries or who have some kind of disability).

ÅB: In Sweden, a certain amount of criticism has been directed at peace education, because "it isn't right to frighten small children". Has that kind of resistance also appeared in Norway?

BB: Yes, we've heard that, and the implication has been that the peace movement was creating unnecessary anxiety. Basically, of course, it is *the existence of nuclear weapons* that creates anxiety, and the child who gets to know about the existence of nuclear weapons, via TV or other means, displays anxiety. And then the teacher must deal with that anxiety. One must, of course, take age level into consideration, and not, as a teacher, assume the initiative of presenting the younger children with these kinds of weapons problems.

Robin Burns (Heidelberg, Victoria, Australia)

My first reaction to this question is that it implies a fairly strict developmental approach to children's learning and I have some difficulties with the implications of Piaget's approach to this on the one hand, as well as Kohlberg's approach and the inherent sexual bias especially in his stages of moral development, on the other.

Obviously, there are different types of activities and issues which are suited to different ages. Complex issues of international relationships cannot be taught as such to six-year-olds, but the assumption that they can only learn about their immediate environment is also inadequate, as research by the Stohls and others in the early 1980s has shown. Another mistake perhaps that we make is to emphasise activities with younger children and cognitive learning and skills with older ones – both need fostering at all

ages.

Complexity is a major concern. Again obviously, there are limits to the use of complex materials and ideas with young children, and I believe it is important to see the inter-relatedness of peace with issues of violence, injustice, poverty, racism, sexism, human rights, ecology and worldviews. Peace education can be an unfolding – from a basis which focuses young children on their attitudes and behaviour in a social context, and on experiential learning of some apparently abstract concepts like 'fairness' and 'co-operation', through all their learnings in the formal educational setting. It is also a challenge to our orthodox disciplinary-based teaching – we rarely get the chance to put different perspectives on an issue together. This is not an argument for an interdisciplinary subject labelled peace studies, but a question to curriculum makers, and a challenge especially to go beyond the social sciences and humanities as the only place where peace perspectives can be included: what about science, technology, physical education, even mathematics?

James Calleja (Valletta, Malta)

With younger students we emphasize the arts and games. For example, a set of games have been drafted, based on cooperation strategies in the classroom. An exchange program was held with the University of Jyväskylä. My student teachers worked on a project on cooperation strategies in the classroom. The same was done by the other student teachers from Jyväskylä, and when we met, we developed through discussion a comparative study, and we discussed what we mean by cooperation, how this could be developed, where it would lead to and what we are trying to achieve through cooperation. We are now at a stage, with some of the students, to discover how the concepts of peace, communication, cooperation and confidence building, could be developed into tuition packages which students themselves could use, with the help of teachers, of course. This is with younger students.

With older students we have worked, for example, with newspapers cuttings, commenting events and with videos, depending on the interests that the students have and what they themselves propose. With older students, we prefer to ask the students what they themselves would prefer to discuss in terms of peace. It is marvellous how many ideas come out! We sort of

leave the initiatives in their hands, and then we act as facilitators or mediators.

Terry Carson (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada)

I think that in the younger grades they can primarily do two things: One is to practice non-violent conflict resolution. It's very important for schools to *model* non-violent conflict resolution. I think at the primary level they can deal with some forms of international understanding in the sense of understanding other people, particularly understanding children in different countries and understanding differences even among children in the own classroom. You can introduce some environmental care at thet level too.

At the upper elementary level, which in Canada is ages 9 to 11, I think you can continue the kind of things which you are doing in the junior grades, but also children of that age are very interested in the rest of the world. They are real collectors of facts. I think we should capitalize on that. At the same time I think that at that age, we can start to introduce a little critical analysis of the media and start to have children think about the kinds of messages they get in their own culture about enemies and about images they get about the rest of the world. In peace education we want to particularly focus on images of violence.

At the secondary school level, I think we can begin to work with things like disarmament education and development education in a more formal way. I wouldn't think of teaching disarmament education until the age of 15 or 16. At the age of 12 to 14 I think they have a great capacity for interest and understanding questions of justice. They can also deal with environmental education at that age, both from the point of view of knowledge and from the point of view of action. At that age the students are fairly autonomous – they can go out and carry out small projects "on the road". The students at the upper secondary school tend not to be as active in terms of practical projects. They are more likely to sit back and intellectualize. I don't think we should let them remain that way, but I think we have to recognize that difference anyway. Dialogue with students in other countries is important at all ages. Both exchanges of letters and personal exchanges should be tried.

James Collinge (Wellington, New Zealand)

Well, I think that with younger students there are a lot of the issues that I would not want to raise, at least not in any formal way. With younger students I would want to place the emphasis on developing positive concepts, on developing cooperative attitudes and developing the attitudes. But I would want those attitudes to continue and develop throughout the school. I want certainly to have the same sort of things that one might hope would start in pre-school, develop right through to the upper years of the secondary school. But with the older students, I would very much want to introduce the major controversial issues that I think that I would not with younger students. When I have spoken to groups of parents and others about peace education, they say: Oh, with my nine-year-old, it would worry him to talk about nuclear questions. I think, well, that is a matter of balance, that is a matter of your judgement. But I think that those probably are questions that I would leave to later (unless these young students bring them up themselves).

Thomas Daffern (London, England)

I think on the whole younger students work with more diverse learning approaches, including cooperative games. A friend of mine is dealing with environmental education, taking kids out into nature. Environmental education is very popular at present, and it appeals to young children quite a lot. Older students cope more with formal education processes. They can use more traditional peace studies material. However, I think that I wouldn't want to stress too much the differences. I would like to see education as a kind of rainbow spectrum and would like to think that we are all young in a sense in approaching new knowledge.

Morton Deutsch (New York, USA)

I think there are primary differences. In younger children certainly you want to help develop the basic orientations of cooperation and respect for self and respect for others, which are fundamental to dealing peacefully with others in a constructive manner, even when there are important dif-

ferences between oneself and the others. And I think that has to be done in terms of the immediate realities for younger children, when the projections in space and in time are not large. As you move up to the older students, for example, in high school, you can get more into substantive issues that are larger in scope than the immediate surroundings.

Virginia Floresca-Cawagas (Quezon City, The Philippines)

Younger students might still be responsive to some kind of inculcation method which will no longer be acceptable to older students. Role modeling which is very effective for children may be seen as a kind of inculcation but adults and older students are much more discerning. Both young and old have to be given chances for more critical thinking and reflection. For the younger kids, a simple activity for consciousness raising can be a start off. For the older ones, simulation games might be more effective; in these kinds of activities the learners put themselves in the peace or conflict situation and act out the resolution of the conflict according to their interpretation of events and the dynamics of relationship that will surface during the simulation. For both younger and older children the experiential approaches are very effective, that is, allowing them to run through real life-situations or a close simulation of such a situation.

Celina Garcia (San José, Costa Rica)

It's known that smaller children learn more by games, by role-playing and by theatre. We all benefit from that, too, but I think as they grow a little older, you can use more of the boring theory, whereas when you deal with the younger grades, you can let the children have a lot of fun by role-playing, by simulation and by theatre.

ÅB: Has it been an issue whether or not you should deal with war, especially nuclear war, in the school?

CG: In Costa Rica we study it, but in Costa Rica the nuclear bomb is felt to be so remote. Some of the teachers that I have done training with use the famous story of the little girl in Hiroshima, Sadako. When they use that, the kids cry and sympathize with the girl, but they cry about it in the same way they would cry about children who have lost their mother. There is no gen-

eral understanding of what nuclear threat is in Costa Rica. It just doesn't sink into our minds; most people don't really understand the potential of total nuclear devastation. However, there is a great awareness in some circles. For instance, they were going to have an atomic lab at the University of Costa Rica, and they refused it. They don't want to have anything to do with nuclear energy.

Henk B. Gerritsma & Daan Verbaan (Groningen, The Netherlands)

DV: In my opinion, peace education differs for older and younger students as to the level of handling the problems. You can't expect the same degree of abstraction from younger pupils in relation to these problems. Therefore, I make the distinction between micro-level and macro-level approaches.

At the primary-school level, pupils should learn how to manage conflicts in their own environment. In this period of their life they should learn such values as solidarity, honesty etc. At the secondary-school level, pupils should learn more about international problems and the possibilities to solve them.

HG: With regard to possible differences in approaches to peace education among younger and older pupils, I want to say first that, compared with the existing school subjects, peace education does not have an exceptional position. We have to deal with the same differences which apply to those school subjects, in the sense that the build-up of the curricula is qualified by and attuned to the age level. The same pedagogic and didactic 'rules' are valid. As a consequence, the same general build-up applies: from a first introduction to international conflicts and problems to a more thorough analysis.

For peace education, however, there has been a tendency to make an exception, in the sense that education on those conflicts and problems has been considered unsuitable for younger pupils because of the danger of 'doomsday thinking' and feelings of helplessness; and because it should be unwarranted to confront children with threatening political questions. Of course, this anxiety is not wrong. But on the other hand, we have to deal with the actual situation that children hear and read the news. In our country there is a special TV news-reel for them, and newspapers have youth-oriented sections. This means that children are confronted daily with

what's going on in the world, and that they have questions and pose them. In my opinion, this cannot be neglected in education. And my experience with teaching materials for younger pupils (not only on secondary level), convinces me that it *is* possible to deal with such questions. It is clear that the age level should be considered, but that is a pedagogic-didactic problem which can be solved.

Haim Gordon (Beer-Sheva, Israel)

In Israel, the younger the student is, the easier it is to eliminate the hatred and the mistrust and the fear. So my general approach would be to start as early as possible, even in the kindergarten, stressing the importance of arranging meetings between children of different backgrounds. Later one should go on with the older children and give them a much more intellectual basis for that, teaching them the literature of other peoples as well as other peoples' geography and history. What is interesting in the Israeli high school, for instance, is that our Arab students learn the Bible, but only the Arabs learn the Koran. Something like that I would like to change, giving all students some appreciation of the cultural heritage of other peoples.

Magnus Haavelsrud (Tromsø, Norway)

It's my impression that you have the right to be dialogic at an early age, at the day-care centers. I myself have a son who goes to a day-care center, and what happens there is very good from the perspective I have described here. But the further the children proceed through the school system, the more "intellectual" the instruction has to be, the more it has to be determined what they should learn. I've heard people say that those who study at school should learn things before they can have any opinions. Such a pedagogical attitude is very dangerous. If it is systematized, it will kill people's attempts to think, to be critical. So it seems to me that what we have here is a mistaken adversarial relationship; at the day-care center you may be allowed to think for yourself, but the older you are, the more conformity is required of you. Then it has almost been determined in advance what you should think. It shouldn't be like that. Instead, the opportunities to participate in a fruitful dialogue should increase continuously.

Ian M. Harris (Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA)

I think that generally amongst younger students it is appropriate to do confidence-building exercises, talk about different races, different cultures, different values that people have, work on communication skills. Then I think with older students it's possible and appropriate to talk more about foreign policy, for instance, different stances that governments can take.

Petra Hesse (Boston, Massachusetts, USA)

In our research on enemy images we find that young children, 4 to 6 year olds, spontaneously think of a monster when you ask them to talk about enemies. So an enemy is one monster or sometimes one person who is threatening, whereas 7-9 year-olds think of enemies as bullies in their school, with whom they have some kind of relationship of enmity.

Because of these findings I have begun to think that with younger children, that is children at the kindergarden age and maybe in the early elementary grades, one should perhaps restrict peace education to their individual, personal, very concrete conflicts in the classroom. I feel I haven't resolved this completely in my mind, but maybe with 5-year-olds and 7-year-olds it makes more sense to them if you help them deal with their own conflicts in the classroom. There they get into a fight with somebody – I hate you, I hate you – and this person is all mad and evil. Maybe it would be most useful to them if we actually helped them to see that perhaps the other person is angry at them too etc. So I think one could lay down some type of foundation of peace education in any grade that maybe isn't so international but focuses on peaceful management of the classroom and classroom conflicts.

Now, if you happen to have a multi-cultural classroom and kids from different racial groups, you may get a fair amount of very personal conflicts between groups in your classroom. So, in other words, you may have a black child fighting with a white child, and they may start yelling at each other: You nigger etc. If you have a multi-cultural classroom, I mean, that's the most elegant way of teaching children interpersonal conflict resolution skills that are already tied to teaching about other cultures and other groups, but through the interactions of specific individuals.

One thing we have done is that we have already immersed very young

children in education about other cultures, but it's not quite clear how it's working. We travel around the world on the globe with young children. We expose children to flags of other countries, to pictures of people in other countries. But it's not quite clear how much of it they take in, it's not clear how much of it they understand, because there is some confusion for them about people inside of America and outside of America etc.

About the age of 10-11-12 it's different. We find in our research that that's the age when children begin to talk about conflicts between groups, begin to talk about war, begin to be curious about the origins of war. So somehow I believe that a real discussion of conflicts beyond the classroom that concern different nations maybe can begin in a really meaningful way only in late childhood. Then I would really talk about other nations, war and conflicts from a more historical perspective.

But that doesn't mean I wouldn't expose younger children, if they have questions about international conflicts. It's very confusing in a way, because obviously many younger children became concerned about war when the Gulf war was going on. They had a lot of questions about what was going on, why the troops were there, how far away it was, whether they were going to be affected by the war, whether their parents were going to be safe and things like that. One should try to answer children's questions honestly. But I would have a bias not to overwhelm let's say 7-year-olds or 5-year-olds with details about war, about wars at different times of history and why we have wars and things like that.

ÅB: Are there some additional results from your research on the development of enemy images that you may tell me about?

PH: What we find is that 4-6 year-old children in different countries tend to think of the enemy as one person who is menacing and who tends to be all evil. Children tend to think that this person cannot be good. They tend to deny that they themselves have conflicts or that other people may see them as being enemies to them, so it's very hard for young children to accept that other people could sometimes think that they are bad or evil or that they are trying to be mean or something like that. So young children have a certain rigidity in their views about good and bad. Enemies are all bad, and they can't be good.

Slightly older children, 7-9 year-olds, tend to think of enemies as bullies in their school. These kids sometimes wait for them on their way home and try to beat them up and tease them and call them names. But children do begin to see that they have a relationship of enmity with these boys, in other

words that the bullies might also see them as an enemy. There is much more mutuality, and they can actually take the perspective of the bully. At the same time I think it's interesting that children in this age group frequently don't know *why* other people think that they might be an enemy. They always blame the other person for the origin of the fight. He started it, it wasn't me. Or they say: Well, I accidentally punched this person. Their contribution to the conflict wasn't intentional, it was accidental. They have different ways of disowning their own contribution to conflict.

It's definitely the goal of peace education, I think, and something one could really do in a classroom, to encourage children to see how they contribute to conflicts. One should also give children a sense that it's O.K., that we all do that. We all do things that are upsetting to other people, and sometimes we mean to do these things, sometimes we don't, giving children a sense that we all contribute to conflict. Let's *accept* our responsibility right in the classroom and let's figure out, I mean, how we contribute, because I think once children do that, it's harder for them to blame other people. I think I really would want to make it harder for children to say: It was him, he's the meany, I didn't do anything.

Up to age 10, children tend to "personalize" enemies; they don't describe the enemy as a member of another ethnic group or cultural group or national group. A switch to a perception of enemies as members of other groups tends to happen between 10 and 12. All of a sudden children spontaneously draw the enemy as a group of people or two groups of people who are fighting each other. They begin to draw flags, so somehow they begin to be aware that enmity has something to do with other nations, with other groups and how groups tend to fight each other. So children around age 10 clearly move beyond the personalized enemy, and I think because of that they are more prone to understand conflicts that involve whole groups. Children at that point also begin to assume more responsibility for their own fights with other individuals. So somewhere between 10 or 12 kids begin to say: Oh, yes, other people see me as the enemy, and I know I do lots of things that may be upsetting to other people. I say things that other people don't like etc.

Starting around 13 years of age – in some children it shows up earlier – children seem to move beyond an identification of enmity with either individuals or groups, and seem to begin to show what some people might call a metacognitive awareness – they become social critics and social philosophers and begin to ask: How come we have conflicts? How come we

have wars? So at that age children become very reluctant to portray a particular group as enemies or draw another person as the enemy. They might say: I don't really have enemies, and I don't believe, you know, that you should have enemies. They begin to draw collages of conflict, where they almost seem to say: There are different types of conflicts in the world. There are personal conflicts, there are political conflicts between groups, etc. At this point children become very reluctant to stereotype other groups, and they begin to say: Why do we have conflicts anyway? What can we do about war? Therefore I tend to believe that – as social studies teachers may have sensed intuitively – 13-15 year-olds are a wonderful age group to really discuss different types of conflicts, to take up political discussions and to encourage students to become politically active. I think there is a lot that schools could do to encourage children at that age to really proceed to action: doing things in their own classrooms but also in their own communities that could make a difference or speaking up politically, writing to political leaders in their communities or becoming involved in various projects that actually could change things.

ÅB: When you originally chose your age groups, what were the reasons for these particular ones? You are not studying each separate age level, you compare groups of ages?

PH: Being trained as a developmental psychologist, I have hunches as to where differences might come in. Piaget has actually written a little about children's political development. I had some reason to believe that changes would occur between these groups. Piaget would describe 4-6 year-olds as pre-operational in their thinking, they are much more intuitive, much more spontaneous. So I thought: let's look at 4-6 year-olds as a group and see what they have to say etc.

ÅB: Were the children equally divided into the three age levels within that group of 4 to 6 years?

PH: No, because it's very hard to talk more than very briefly to 4-year-olds, I think most of our subjects in this age group are 5- or 6-year-olds. Among the older children, however, we have an even age distribution within the groups.

ÅB: Were there some sex differences in your results?

PH: There is a certain tendency in our data for young girls to know less about enemies. 4-6-year-old girls frequently haven't heard the word enemy, and when you explain to them what enemies are, they are very reluctant to talk about enemies or to draw enemies. Instead they frequently want to

draw good girls, rainbows or other positive things.

Then there are sex differences among the 7-9-year-olds in that boys tend to draw conflicts with other boys, and these tend to be physical conflicts. Girls tend to draw conflicts between girls, but these are frequently more emotional conflicts and verbal quarrels. Girls frequently draw speech-bubbles. So we find some kind of gender segregation in mid-childhood: boys seem to be fighting with boys, and girls seem to be fighting with girls. Many boys, I think, have been told that they are stronger than girls and that they shouldn't beat up girls, that is not a nice thing to do. And I think girls have been told to stay away from boys. They tend to stay away from each other.

In the older age groups – actually primarily among the 10 to 12-year-olds – boys seem to be much freer in their portrayal of intergroup conflict and even seem to sort of enjoy drawing conflicts between groups. They show a lot of shooting and fighting, there are whole armies that march against each other and groups drop bombs on other groups. I've noticed that some boys really draw these images with great enjoyment. Girls 10-12 years old seem to know as much about enemies and conflict as boys, but seem to be more concerned about the impact or the effects of war, so girls are much more likely than boys to draw graveyards and people who die as a result of war, people who are hurt by war. So girls are also concerned about war and know about war but think more about the victims. Maybe girls continue to personalize conflict more than boys do. I feel that I have to analyze my data more carefully to make that point with confidence, but there is definitely a certain tendency for girls to be more worried about the victims, whereas the boys seem to be more caught up in drawing weapons.

ÅB: Do you work with quantitative content analysis in this research, or do you primarily give illustrative, qualitative descriptions of the children's reactions?

PH: You could see the whole research as predominantly qualitative in its approach, but we definitely also do quantitative analysis of what percentage of children give certain types of reactions. So we have a mixture of qualitative and quantitative techniques in the analyses.

David Hicks (Bath, England)

I will want to qualify in a moment, but I think one of the main differences

is this: Primary teachers dealing with the children from 5 to 11 will very much look at conflicts and cooperation and issues that deal with fairness or justice, that is, deal with the classroom climate and the school atmosphere. They will deal with conflicts in the playground, in the classroom, developing cooperative games for example. In the secondary school, however, it would be more likely that someone would say: Well, in history I am working with the relationship between the superpowers after World War II. Or: In geography, I am looking at issues of development and underdevelopment. Or: In English, we are looking at some teenage science fiction stories about the holocaust or we are looking at poetry and literature that deals with peace and conflict. Having said that, I want to add that my experience also is that children aged 8-11 in primary school can be very interested in particular issues, both local and global, and in their own way are quite knowledgeable, so I think there is a place also with younger children for looking at particular issues.

Kathleen Kanet (New York, USA)

I am not sure of exactly what age the students can deal judgmentally with issues, really study hunger and the arms race and make a judgement. I have a feeling that there is a developmental appropriateness that we do not know enough about. I guess that the conceptual approach may be more appropriate for younger students, the exploration of the issues for older students. Our experience is that some of the resistances to peace education in the past were related to the fact that some of the outreaches were inappropriate and some of the expectations put upon students were inappropriate to their developmental readiness. When I hear that a teacher of young children have them involved in a boycot or a religion teacher have the students go out to solicit names for a petition against abortion, I would question the appropriateness of such actions. I do not think that the school should stimulate advocacy for specific positions, although – at the appropriate age level – the issues should be explored and debated.

Søren Keldorff (Aalborg, Denmark)

As far as both older and younger students are concerned, I think it's wise to

start working with the problems by teaching them about the developing countries. But, of course, there are more possibilities of approaching the agonizing issues of an imminent nuclear war with the older students.

ÅB: In Sweden, peace education has been criticized on those very grounds, i.e. that it might have a frightening effect. Has this kind of criticism occurred in Denmark as well, and how do you personally look at this problem?

SK: I think I have already mentioned that I don't really believe you can achieve very much by frightening people. With his customary knack of shocking the idealistic bourgeoisie, Jan Øberg has called this tendency "nuclear-war pornography". The "workshops of the future" that I described earlier take a different, and more positive, psychological approach – the clearly universal human incentives for hope and action. I'm not an expert on small children and the elementary school, but it seems to me that there is a considerable difference between saying – as Bertel Haarder, our Minister of Education, did – "It's a pity to frighten children by talking about nuclear war" and thinking along the following lines: The realities behind the armament situation of the superpowers don't look very bright. But the world has been recreated over and over again, when people have worked actively and energetically to bring about a change. Take, for example, the abolition of illiteracy in large parts of the world, the abolition of slavery, the abolition of "stavnsbåndet" (a temporary Danish law prohibiting Danish peasants from leaving their place of birth), the increasing political equality of previously oppressed groups, such as black people, women etc.

Herbert C. Kelman (Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA)

The one thing that immediately comes to my mind is something that has been a matter of debate with regard to the nuclear-war teaching. Some of the opponents of introducing issues of nuclear war into the curriculum have argued that – particularly when you deal with younger students – you are frightening them and artificially creating problems. They say that those who argue that children are already frightened are wrong: children get frightened only by schools or by parents who are putting these ideas into their minds. These kinds of problems – such as the degree to which educational experiences with regard to war really create anxieties – are particularly severe among younger children. I do not mean that older stu-

dents, or even adults, have no reason to be frightened, but, presumably, when you are dealing with young children, you have a greater obligation to worry about the kinds of reactions you are stimulating.

I can mention here one of the things that I remember from my childhood. It was in the thirties, in a period of great upheaval in Austria where I lived at that time; the chancellor had been assassinated, and there was talk about war. Then we were told in the schools about gasmasks, and I remember the whole concept of gasmasks just frightened the hell out of me.

So I do think these things have an effect on children and this is the main thing that comes to my mind. On the other hand, I don't subscribe to the notion that therefore we can't deal with the threat of war in schools. The fact of the matter is that there is no way in which children living in the modern world and watching television freely and frequently can avoid confrontation with the question of nuclear weapons and nuclear war. Just because you keep it out of school you are not going to keep it out of their lives. So I don't accept the notion that you can't introduce it in schools, but I do think that one has to be very sensitive about *how* it is introduced, and the more so the younger the children are.

Alberto L'Abate (Florence, Italy)

I do not see much difference, in fact. Of course, when we go to kindergarten, for example, we do not give the composition as a task as we do in school, but instead we ask them to make drawings. Adults are much more actively interested in doing things to show to other groups, for example organize an exhibition. But we find the same interest in role-playing for the youngest and the oldest ones, for example. We have experimented with students, over the whole age range from the youngest to the adults, and personally I do not see much important difference. Of course, you have to speak with the language adapted to the level, but you do not in reality need to use different approaches.

Linda Lantieri (New York, USA)

We have a very comprehensive curriculum and our main concepts about conflict, peace, justice, cooperation, prejudice reduction are there in

kindergarten and they are there in the sixth grade as well but in more depth. Probably the older kids have a little more of a world point of view, although a lot of the younger kids are beginning to have that too. For the most part there are some differences in the depth, but we try to introduce a lot of the concepts at a very early age.

Max Lawson (Armidale, New South Wales, Australia)

Obviously a great number of games and role plays would be used in the junior school, particular games and activities that involve breaking down physical space, for example, games in which children of different races have to hug one another and dance with one another. One criticism, which I think is justified in some instances, of peace education in Australia is showing films like "The Day After" to young children who are terrified by these films. I cannot emphasize too strongly that many of the films dealing with effects of nuclear war, films about concentration camps and so on, must be kept to the upper reaches of the senior school. I know this sounds dogmatic. But if this material is introduced too soon, it often can have very distressing effects. With younger people we should stress positive and hopeful aspects as much as possible.

ÅB: If we include still higher age levels, thinking of your own course on peace education for undergraduates, what would be some of the most important themes that you would like to take up in a peace education course at that stage?

ML: I start off with inner peace, emphasizing that the personal and the political are closely related, that you cannot work effectively for nuclear disarmament if you are a heavily psychologically armed person yourself, if you are an unpeaceful person yourself. So the first part of my course draws heavily upon the work of Adam Curle, particularly his books "Mystics and Militants", "Education for Liberation" and "Making Peace". The course gradually develops into the study of interpersonal peace and the resolution of conflict. Workshops for the first part of the course, often initiated by students, deal with meditation and other paths to inner peace, conflict resolution, assertiveness training and related issues.

The course gradually moves on to content-orientated issues, particularly stressing how to teach controversial issues in a classroom and raises the question of indoctrination in classrooms. In the workshops in this part of

the course, students choose an issue which they are diametrically opposed to and have to argue the opposite case. At this stage of the course, when the personal and the interpersonal and the political are starting to come together, I have a one-day workshop called a despair and empowerment workshop using the work of Joanna Macy. In this I am helped with a colleague from the Drama Department. I and the students find this a highlight of the course and I relate the empowerment themes to the conscientization of Paulo Freire who is the next educator introduced in the theoretical part of the course. Other issues dealt with in the course are the theory of a just war, the tradition of non-violence, and structural violence. Each topic theory is tied to practical exercises in a workshop situation.

Stig Lindholm (Copenhagen, Denmark; Sweden)

I have never done any research about younger students, so I am only an amateur as far as they are concerned. But of course you have to adapt yourself to the various levels.
ÅB: Does the questionnaire material you have been working with only apply to upper secondary school?
SL: Yes, it was aimed at school administrators in the upper secondary school, and there was also a questionnaire for 1,000 students, all of them in upper secondary school. That is all we have.
ÅB: Are there any results that you think are worth mentioning?
SL: There is a distinct difference between boys and girls. Girls care more, they seem to be more involved. This can also be observed among adults. As you know, we have a seminar. When we have invited someone who is not very famous, some 80-90 % of those who attend are women. If a well-known speaker has been invited, 60 % are women. Obviously women are more involved in the subject as such. By the way, this is a strong trend which can be observed in many studies carried out in different countries. That was the most palpable thing in the pattern of results. – When it comes to the course programmes in upper secondary school, the results were more vague and difficult to interpret, since different schools were involved.

Mildred Masheder (London, England)

My personal interest has very much focused on the young children, among other things because we need to start early. I am sure that one of the differences could be that older students can be more fully exposed to all sides of various political views and be able to learn enough about the facts to be able to form their own opinions. There is so much hidden propaganda in this field, however, that I think that one has to be careful to arrive at a balance. But I think that most of what I have said applies all the way through the school: Communication, listening, inner peace, problem-solving, cooperation, understanding – these are not just for the younger ones.

On the other hand, we have to remember that the young people are seeing endless examples on television of what is happening in the third world, what is happening in wars, and so one has got to start fight early to give them the other side of things: the hopes and working for peace. One has also to bring them up to be very critical of words and images conveyed by the mass media.

Gerald F. Mische (New York, USA)

The early years are the most important in terms of a long-range perspective. If you are only concerned about solving problems the next 3-4 years, you might work mostly with older students. But if you think in terms of longer range, it's the younger years that you should attend to. Young children are more open, they are less prejudiced by political, ideological and cultural influences. It's at that period that one can present them with a holistic and broad world view, the image of being one with the world and dealing with a common future. Research has shown that beyond that among older students, it is more difficult to change attitudes.

Valentina Mitina (Moscow, Russia)

The students are very different in the first and second grades and the upper high school. The younger pupils are simply not able to understand parts of the relevant content. Not only the content but also the methods should be

adapted to the capability of their age level.

One aspect of peace education that should be developed early is the multi-cultural approach. Most of our communities are multi-national communities. First of all the children have to know about their own traditions. They have to know about their own peculiarities. And then they have to know that there are other people living next to them who are similar to them in many respects, but who have their own traditions and peculiarities. This could be dealt with in the kindergarten and in the elementary school, maybe using songs and dolls in different costumes as the starting-point for a discussion.

Robert Muller (Escazu, Costa Rica; New York, USA)

I am not an expert enough in this field to say something valid. But I have observed that as children become older they move from simple and natural, sentimental views to more intellectual views. So you have to teach peace with sentimental and simple means when they are young, and with more intellectual means when they are older. But this should not be done onesidedly. The onesided development of intelligence at the expense of sentiment and spirit is one of the catastrophies of our age. I think we should remain affective, natural and sentimental all our lives through until our moment of death.

A friend of mine, Dr. Jampolski in California, who is taking care of children who are dying of cancer has published the views of children about peace. The little children see peace in the form of a blooming cherry-tree, of a beautiful little rabbit, of the sun, of the stars, of a smile, of flowers, of extended hands. As the children get older, their view of peace deteriorates. It becomes more and more intellectual, and what they say about peace at the age of 14 I would practically throw into the waste-paper basket. What is happening is that we take away the ingenuity of peace from children and replace it by a sophistication that has contributed to most of the troubles in which we find ourselves. Throughout the sophistication of learning, we should cultivate and maintain the ingenuity of a child. Here is an important subject which ought to be given a lot of thought in the field of peace education.

Eva Nordland (Oslo, Norway)

To me, it's not so much a matter of fundamental differences as what type of projects and problems you choose. Since I attach such great importance to the pupils choosing for themselves, in a way that also takes care of itself. I see essentially the same thing happening in my groups of students of social pedagogy and in junior-level groups at the Norwegian ASPRO schools: when the pupils choose problems that they are absorbed in, knowledge and skills are acquired as a result of solving those problems.
ÅB: Has there been a discussion in Norway as well of the potential risks of involving children who are too young in certain types of peace education?
EN: Yes, there has, but it's not very relevant if you consider my view of what peace education should involve. The first time a child caresses your cheek, it is somehow an active manifestation of peace, it has something to do with care and cooperation. To me it's self-evident that we should start as early as possible to inculcate habits, attitudes and expectations, but it is done concurrently with a development that's going to take place no matter what.

Mitsuo Okamoto (Hiroshima, Japan)

This, I think, is a difficult question to answer. However, I think peace education for the smaller children can often start from the actions of the children. For example, young children are, in my experience, interested in teasing other children because of differences they have. For instance, if somebody has a different accent, the other children tease him or her. This kind of aggressive attitude of the majority can be brought up in some way, so that the young children can be made to understand that people are different in many ways – some people speak the same language with a different accent. They can be shown audio-visual material where related stories are communicated. With the older students, I think various kinds of fieldwork are perhaps more effective, and the students can easily leave campus. With younger children one must be very careful in taking them to the streets or to some violent sector of a larger city, while older students can do that, being themselves very careful about their own protection.

Priscilla Prutzman (Nyack, New York, USA)

One thing would be thinking about the developmental levels of the children. For instance, in kindergarten we might use, instead of role playing, pantomime or puppets, whereas the older children may play the roles themselves. Further, for the younger children it's harder to be just a part of an activity so we take that in consideration. For instance, in the cooperative machine building that we just talked about, K-2 children might choose a train as their machine for example and feel they are the whole train, whereas older children could do a more complicated machine that involved really understanding how the different parts work together. Around the fourth grade is when people often begin to be able to see another person's point of view and that relates both to this cooperation theme and certainly to the conflict resolution. We tend to use role playing or dramatization with the older children who are able to get outside of themselves and see another point of view, while the younger children have difficulties with that.

Hanns-Fred Rathenow (Berlin, Germany)

Peace education is a long-term process of changing values. Pupils and students learn our values in everyday family life, in peer-groups, and at school. As teachers we have the task to equate the content of peace education with our teaching attitudes, the teaching behaviour, to equate the manner and the matter of what we are teaching. So "practice what you preach" should be the overall aim for everybody concerned with peace education. As to different levels of education it is clear that developing confidence and care, responsibility and cooperation should be the basis in the primary school – as part of every good education. Informal education could be even more important at this stage than in further ages – the solution of a bully in the classroom, for example, could help to reinforce overall aims of peace education. To reduce stereotypes, prejudices and enemy images in a multicultural society should already begin at this level. At advanced levels of education we'll find subject-oriented approaches more suitable. Look at sciences. Developing social responsibility in using technological advances should belong to the standards of every Maths and Physics teaching. So there is no need to create special curricula on peace education. The only necessity is that teachers bear in mind the objectives of peace education.

Nevertheless, I think that this has to be thought through carefully. Think about physical education, for instance. If I make competition the most important thing in physical training, then this could be counter-productive to peace education. In this case peace education is a cross-curricular approach permeating every subject and every hour in the school's timetable.

Douglas Ray (London, Ontario, Canada)

With younger students I think you try to tie your examples to their community to a greater extent, to the familiar things. Older students have had an opportunity to read more widely, to see more television, to meet people from other parts of the world, perhaps to travel. They have a better understanding that this is a big and complex world, and you can deal with the abstractions better. You don't have to spend as much time building up the background, because they already have quite a lot of that.

I think too that because of the children's maturation, for example, younger pupils are probably not so interested in the question of sex, while older students may be almost pre-occupied with this matter. So your discrimination examples might deal in younger students with relationships among playmates, whereas older students might be thinking in terms of potential marriage partners. You might be thinking also in terms of regulations of the labour force with older students, because they are coming closer to entry in the labor market.

I think that it is possible to begin peace education or human rights education very early. However, probably the essential limitations are: What can the kids understand when presented in the format in which we are presenting it? Very often, if we can find a different format, they *can* understand ideas which we think are too complex for them.

ÅB: What do you think about the specific information about what war means or what nuclear war might mean? To what extent and in what form should that be included, and for what ages?

DR: Surely children by the age of four or five are quite conversant with violence. Many of their toys, particularly I think boys' toys, deal with violence. There are guns and planes and things like that. Many of the games that they play deal with make-believe death and I suppose that many of them are familiar from their reading with stories of war and heroism. They perhaps empathize with some aspects of this – the heroism, the gallantry,

the glory. They don't have a good understanding of, through the type of reading typically made available through the media to kids, the horrors of war. My concern is that kids are likely grow up with a very mistaken notion of war. War is not something where you point your finger or a toy-gun at a person and yell: Bang! The person falls down and five minutes later he is playing again. War isn't like that! The kids have to realize that war in the adult world means kids going off, perhaps never again to return. They are not likely to become aware of this aspect of war until they start, probably at the age of twelve or thereabout, studying the reality of war in our society today. It may come about through the schools or through other agencies, but I think kids do have to realize that war is a deadly, very very serious business.

I think they also have to realize that often it is started for the flimsiest of excuses. There is a silly war in European history which was fought, because a person had an ear chopped off. The war of revenge was called The War of Jenkin's Ear. In reality many of our wars are fought for that kind of flimsy excuses. We need to help the kids realize that there are other and better ways of resolving disputes than going at one another with bayonets and bombs; and we have to deal with the successes of alternative solutions. An example in the Scandinavian countries is the resolution of how the peoples of Norway and Sweden should govern themselves which was in dispute by the turn of the century. In some cases a similar type of dispute probably would have led to war. In this case it led to a resolution which is more or less satisfactory to all parties and certainly has not left two bitter enemies.

Most types of disputes have losers and perhaps both sides have to remember that it is important to lose a little bit and not win completely if it is to be a just solution. Kids I think can understand this kind of thing and we can help them through various types of games, where they take the perspective of different countries trying to solve problems of society. In a semirealistic way, they thereby aquire something of the feeling of what it is like to have this kind of an agenda to deal with. If they fail to be able to take another's perspective, I think they remain immature and unable to understand these types of quarrels and the reasons why they are so difficult in many cases to resolve.

Betty Reardon (New York, USA)

Our general aims would be about the same for students of different ages, but obviously the approaches will be different. For instance, you do not deal with complex abstractions when you work with younger children.

Among the young students I think it's natural to make them aware of certain affective dimensions or value dimensions, for example, in relation to injustice. They should be aware that injustice causes pain to people and they should feel discomfort at other people's pain. – Differences – cultural and social differences – should be taught as interesting rather than something negative. – Relations to our planet Earth could be taken up early; the teachers could facilitate the children's understanding that the Earth is suffering and needs to be healed.

All those things I have now mentioned as relevant for young students can be dealt with also at a secondary level, but at that stage they can be discussed in more abstract terms, concepts like disarmament, structural violence, ecological balance can be introduced etc. The data related to poverty and development, the arms race expenditures etc. can also be studied.

Tom Roderick (New York, USA)

The main difference is the extent to which you connect the inter-personal skills they are learning to what's going on in society and the world. The older students are more aware of the rest of the world and are more able to make generalizations and deal with abstract concepts. Our main emphasis with the elementary students has been inter-personal conflict resolution. Certainly there are places where you can make connections to societal and global conflicts with elementary school children; but we get a lot more opportunity to do that with high-school students. Also, with high-school students there are different kinds of conflicts and more intensity, related to the changes that go on in adolescence.

ÅB: So in this particular program you have had a special focus on creative conflict resolution. Would you also take up what was the early focus of ESR – the nuclear issues?

TR: We would if they come up, and there are places in the curriculum where nuclear issues could possibly be brought in. But these days it doesn't seem to be something that's on our students' minds. Students in New York

seem to be more concerned about getting mugged on the way home, or about being shot by a drug-dealer or having a fight with their parents. ESR has a very good curriculum on U.S.-Soviet relations, so the organization are still addressing issues of relationships between the superpowers. But that has not been our emphasis during the past few years in New York.

Paul Rogers (Belfast, Northern Ireland)
& Maura Ward (Blackrock, Co. Dublin, Ireland)

MW: That is difficult to answer, since it depends much on the total context. We aim at an education where students learn from experience and this experience can be adapted to various ages and interests.
PR: The only difference I would think of would be related to what the students would be able to cope with as determined by their developmental stage. Activity and experiential learning are most important for all age groups.

Bogdan Rowinski (Konstancin, Poland)

I think the differences should be adapted to the level of psychological development of the students. In kindergarten we should start to create positive attitudes to different people – to people of different views, and to teach children to cooperate with different people – to teach them to be tolerant of differences. The more the pupils grow up, the more we should develop responsibility and motivation to act.
ÅB: What do you think could be done in the classroom to develop responsibility?
BR: I think that one important condition is to train the pupils to decide what to do by themselves. When dealing with a poor country with many problems and in need of aid, the teacher can put the problem to the class: What can *we* do? We cannot go there and build houses for instance, but we can do something. The pupils will forward suggestions, discuss and make decisions. Perhaps they decide to collect medicines after checking with a doctor. Perhaps they can invite a child for vacation.

Paul Smoker (Yellow Springs, Ohio, USA)

Yes, in a way. Because of the political and structural situation it is *easier* to use education for peace approaches among younger children. But I don't think that this is an intrinsic difference. I think the educational processes, if you are 10 years old or 90 years old, are essentially very similar. I personally and in an ideal world believe in the same education for peace approach at all levels and in society at large. But this is not the way the world is and therefore one tries to compromise and move the world in that direction.

Toh Swee-Hin (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada)

Of course, one difference would be in terms of scope of knowledge, the amount of knowledge the students know in depth. I have heard some arguments saying that because students are young, they should not consider peace education topics at all; you should leave it till later. I and my Filipino friends in peace education do not agree. By postponing so-called "difficult" topics, we have lost an important opportunity to touch the inner beings of our students.

The area of justice would be an example. I think that from an early age we all learn about justice, just from our own personal experience; children know early what is fair and not fair. You do not need to have a university degree to know what is fair and not fair. We have to build upon those natural feelings that most normal human beings have and therefore not postpone topics of injustice. In development education a food game is often used in order to illustrate unfair distribution in the world society (a game in which a few children get a lot of good food, whereas other children in the classroom get little). This game can foster empathy and some understanding of power relations in the world. If such a food game can give younger children some early notion of justice/injustice in the world and how people feel about it, we then later on deepen their knowledge, for example, when they learn about the trade system at higher school levels.

So school education is in a sense like a system of building blocks. We need foundations in all issues. The area of racism and prejudice is another area that could be dealt with early. Values formation begins very early well before school starts, and educating for peace should not avoid conscious-

ness-raising and personal empowerment from the first day of school. We just have to be sensitive to the amount of knowledge that people can digest at different ages.

Judith Torney-Purta (College Park, Maryland, USA)

For young children it is important that you help them build a representative of the world, reasonably accurate spatially or geographically and also to get some sense of history, not just memorizing dates but with some sense of what happened in the different centuries. I also think that appreciation of their own government and political institutions is an important part of young children's education. By the time they are 10 or 11, a more complex representation can be developed, and at the secondary level you are able to return to these issues in a more complex fashion.

At present in the United States we have an enormous number of immigrant children who come into the system without any understanding of American society or political institutions. This creates special difficulties.

Lennart Vriens (Utrecht, The Netherlands)

I think I have already talked about this to some extent. I think that older students need much more information about what's really going on in the world; older students should be oriented in the world. If you are to be responsible for it, then you should know about it. However, it's not necessary to be a war expert or a peace expert to understand that you shouldn't use atomic bombs; and it's not necessary to know the exact number of missiles on the West side and on the East side. But among other things children should learn how to make moral judgements.

It is important – when dealing with younger as well as older students – that the information should not destroy all the joy of life. I think that peace education should always try to open up possibilities, or to give the impression that we are working with the world; that we are trying to build a new and better world and that we are not only against something bad. It has also some relation to the tricky mental-health issue. Some people have talked about anxiety about nuclear war as a problem of public health, as a problem concerning the mental health of young people. This is worth discussing, but

you might also ask: Who is mentally healthy? The person who is scared, or the person who is not scared?

Riitta Wahlström (Jyväskylä, Finland)

An important point is that it is not wise to inform the younger students about the dangers of nuclear warfare and the terrible results of global pollution. Young children's thinking is characterized by a level of concrete operations which makes it difficult for them to understand these issues, and it would be wrong to risk increasing their anxiety by handing over too much information of this kind to them. But if children ask, then it is a good time to discuss these things. Older students, on the other hand, should deal with these issues, of course. While such differences in content would be natural, I do not think that the kind of pedagogy has to be very different for younger and older students. In both cases, I would prefer non-authoritarian and problem-oriented methods, where problems as experienced by the students themselves are good starting-points, and where group discussions, workshops, drama etc. are important aids in the process of acquiring and handling knowledge.

Zlmarian J. Walker (Brasilia, Brazil)

I think, at least in our case, with younger children we try to build the concepts of peace education into their daily lives. As they get older they can differentiate the different issues involved in these concepts and you can talk about them and present them. The older children definitely can see: Oh, this is a problem. With the younger children we try not to emphasize the problem aspects; we try to show a model or norm. Cooperation is worked with as the norm; we do not talk about the lack of cooperation as a problem. With the older students, you can treat these things separately.

Christoph Wulf (Berlin, Germany)

Up to the end of the 1980s the peace movement and its green counterpart gained more and more importance in the Federal Republic of Germany.

One aspect of these two movements that has influenced the attitudes of school students is the way in which the movements have gained in importance in society at large, outside school. At present, questions of disarmament have receded into the background. Environmental pollution, by contrast, is a matter of grave concern for people in general and it attracts the attention of children and school students. Within society, increasing attention is being demanded by the conflicts and acts of violence that are coming to the fore in the wake of the aimlessness of many young people after the collapse of the German Democratic Republic.

Richard Yarwood (London, England)

I think not as many as one might think. Obviously the depth of analysis can increase as you increase in age. But if you are dealing with values and attitudes, then in many ways it is crucial that you catch children young before they are set in their thinking, and I don't think that necessarily the age will affect the quality of that kind of teaching situation. When working with links between the personal area, the community and the international area, with younger children you concentrate more on the personal end of that spectrum, building it up into the international as they develop. In terms of method, there are obviously certain methods which are more appropriate for older children, like debate, but a lot of the methods that I have used anyway are with slight adaption as suitable for late primary as they are for adult groups.

Nigel Young (Hamilton, New York, USA)

For young children it is important that you help them build a representative of the world, reasonably accurate spatially or geographically and also to get some sense of history, not just memorizing dates but with some sense of what happened in the different centuries. I also think that appreciation of their own government and political institutions is an important part of young children's education. By the time they are 10 or 11, a more complex representation can be developed, and at the secondary level you are able to return to these issues in a more complex fashion.

At present in the United States we have an enormous number of immi-

grant children who come into the system without any understanding of American society or political institutions. This creates special difficulties.

References

Ankarstrand-Lindström, G. & Bjerstedt, Å. (Eds.) *Sex danska och sex svenska röster om undervisning för fred.* /Six Danish and six Swedish voices on peace education./ Malmö: School of Education, 1988.

Bjerstedt, Å. Fifty peace educators: Self-portraits in passing from twenty-two countries. *Peace Education Reports*, No. 7, 1993.

Svensson, S.E. "En värld utan krut skulle förhindra ett förhastat slut!" – Gymnasieelever skriver om fred och krig. /"A world without gunpowder would prevent a hasty end!" – Students in the Swedish upper secondary school write about peace and war./ *Särtryck och småtryck*, Nr 641, 1989.

Svensson, S.E. Ungdomars kunskaper om fred och krig – Redovisning av en studie i gymnasieskolan. /Young people's knowledge of peace and war – A study in the Swedish upper secondary school./ *Pedagogisk-psykologiska problem*, Nr 541, 1990.

Tvingstedt, A.-L. Samtal med elever i årskurs 2 om krig och fred. /Conversations with Swedish children i grade 2 about war and peace./ *Pedagogisk-psykologiska problem*, Nr 514, 1989.

Utas Carlsson, K. Samtal om fred och krig med elever i årskurs 5. /Conversations about peace and war with Swedish children in grade 5./ *Pedagogisk-psykologiska problem*, Nr 534, 1990.